

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) will be postponed.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution.

LIMITING AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, we are nearing the end of this bill, and we have had good progress so far. We are on the very last title, as my colleagues know, and there are only 9 amendments remaining, and in the interests of attempting to expeditiously move the bill and to finish the bill at an early hour this evening, I wish to propose a unanimous consent request:

That during the further consideration of H.R. 2670 in the Committee of the Whole, no amendment shall be in order except for pro forma amendments offered by the chairman and ranking member and the following amendments which may be offered only by the Member designated, shall be considered as read, if printed, shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole, and shall be debatable for 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and a Member opposed thereto:

An amendment by Mr. KUCINICH numbered 1;

An amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL numbered 5;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY numbered 7;

An amendment by Mr. TAUZIN and Mr. DINGELL regarding FCC regulations;

An amendment by Mr. WYNN increasing EEOC, with a decrease in the State Department funds;

An amendment by Mr. HAYWORTH regarding U.N. World Heritage Sites;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding hate crimes;

An amendment by Mr. DAVIS of Illinois regarding law enforcement grants; and

An amendment by Mr. DINGELL regarding criminal records upgrade.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. SERRANO. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I will not be objecting, I just wanted to ask two questions, one of whomever. Is it our intent on any votes that may be involved here to roll those votes or cluster those votes?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SERRANO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS. The intent is that we will roll the votes until concluded and then take all of the votes at the same time.

Mr. SERRANO. And secondly, does the gentleman from Kentucky know if we could save any more time? Are there any of these amendments that the gentleman is willing to accept from our side without any further debate?

Mr. ROGERS. There very well may be.

Mr. SERRANO. But he is not about to tell me right now.

Mr. ROGERS. Time will tell, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SERRANO. Time is what I had in mind, and saving even more.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 273 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2670.

□ 1810

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with Mr. HASTINGS of Washington in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose earlier

today, a request for a recorded vote on the amendment by the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) had been postponed.

Pursuant to the order of the House today, no amendment shall be in order except pro forma amendments offered by the chairman and ranking member and the following amendments which may be offered only by the Member designated, shall be considered read, if printed, shall not be subject to amendment or to a demand for a division of the question and shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by a proponent and an opponent:

An amendment by Mr. KUCINICH numbered 1;

An amendment by Mr. CAMPBELL numbered 5;

An amendment by Mr. CROWLEY numbered 7;

An amendment by Mr. TAUZIN and Mr. DINGELL regarding FCC regulations;

An amendment by Mr. WYNN increasing EEOC, with decrease in State Department;

An amendment by Mr. HAYWORTH regarding U.N. World Heritage Sites;

An amendment by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas regarding hate crimes;

An amendment by Mr. DAVIS of Illinois regarding law enforcement grants; and

An amendment by Mr. DINGELL regarding criminal records history upgrade.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAYWORTH

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYWORTH:

At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for any activity in support of adding or maintaining any World Heritage Site in the United States on the List of World Heritage in Danger as maintained under the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage.

Mr. HAYWORTH (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment has a simple purpose. It prohibits spending any money on any activity in support of adding or maintaining any World Heritage site in the United States on the list of world heritage in danger. It is based on the provision in the American Land Sovereignty Protection Act,

H.R. 883 which passed in this House on May 20 of this year by voice vote.

The World Heritage Committee influences activities that occur around World Heritage Sites by putting such sites on what is entitled the "List of World Heritage in Danger." As many of my colleagues know, Mr. Chairman, the World Heritage Committee has been attempting to extend the reach of the convention concerning the protection of the world's cultural and natural heritage beyond a world heritage site in an effort to influence activities around the site. Unfortunately, the World Heritage Committee has interfered several times in ongoing internal economic development permitting processes of sovereign nations, including a project on private land in the United States.

The World Heritage Committee, with the approval of the executive branch, has ignored Federal law and infringed on constitutionally protected private property rights by disrupting the National Environmental Policy Act process for a project located on private land. Under the World Heritage Convention, the World Heritage Committee monitors activities in and around a site in danger, and the country in which the site in danger is located is obligated to aid the committee in this monitoring.

□ 1815

A site remains on the list of World Heritage sites in danger until the host country agrees to implement the committee's recommendations concerning land use around the site, which generates international pressure on the country to follow the World Heritage committee's recommendations. Policies implemented in accordance with recommendations of the World Heritage committee can limit the use of privately owned property, thereby reducing its value.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, will help stop international organizations from interfering in United States land use decisions.

Mr. Chairman, if one supports American sovereignty, I urge them to support this amendment. If one supports the constitutionally granted right of Congress to affect Federal land policy, I urge them to support this amendment. If one supports the American Land Sovereignty Act, I urge them to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to vote yes on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Who seeks time in opposition?

Mr. SERRANO. I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to yield that time to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) and have him control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. One of the historians wrote about our Nation and about some of the American spirit, one of the things that they observed was our parks, and they pointed out that our parks and conservation of our landscape is one of the best ideas that Americans ever had.

Back in the 1960s, then President Nixon was successful in leading globally in terms of establishing the World Heritage Convention Treaty. Since we first signed that treaty, we have 152 different nations that have signed the treaty and have identified over 500 World Heritage sites. These are some parks in our country, only about 20 sites are recognized in our country as being World Heritage sites, but in other countries, almost 500 sites are recognized in those countries, the other 151 countries.

It is a way we can obviously lead in terms of demonstrating voluntary conservation. Every one of these sites, first of all, before it can be included and designated or recognized on this list, must be already protected. The land is already protected before it is included in this treaty provision.

Secondly, the requirement is completely voluntary. If the country does not want it listed, it does not become listed, so we have to nominate these particular sites.

So my point is that this amendment would pull the rug out from under the U.S. leadership on an international basis for voluntary conservation of park-like sites in our country.

One of the recommendations, if in fact the country does not proceed in terms of protecting the sites that they have agreed to protect, that they had protected before they nominated them for listing, is that they can be delisted. In some cases where there is degradation that goes on to a park or cultural site, they will obviously recognize that as a site at risk.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to state that the statement made by the author of this amendment is just not based on fact. There is no problem with the World Heritage Convention. It is essentially an international agreement where the host country, in this case the United States, has to say that we will participate and we will protect those lands before we even bring them to you to be on the list.

I rise as cochair of the Congressional Tourism Caucus. We have places like

Yellowstone, places that are already protected under the National Park System. We have to do that as a country. The World Heritage Commission cannot do it. They have no authority over how to regulate land. That is uniquely an American and State and local government process.

But if you are very proud of a piece of land that you protected, as we have been in California in protecting a lot of parks and have nominated our State parks, and even some county water districts have nominated their lands to be part, they want this designation, because it is a prestigious designation. It is like the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval. It is essentially saying that this area is recognized as a special spot on the Earth for wildlife preservation and for the program to manage the land well.

This is all done by the host country, not by any international organization. It is a convention where all with like kinds of land can come together and say if you do these things in your host country, then you can be on this list.

So the gentleman who has offered this amendment, in saying that this has ability to affect private lands, is totally wrong, unless that landowner, as we have in Big Sur, California, had nominated their private lands to be protected. Then it can be protected, if it meets the criteria. But to come along unilaterally and designate it is totally false.

I ask for a rejection of this amendment in strong terms.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I think that this amendment, at best, could be described as a misunderstanding. But the fact is for us, after being emulated by 151 nations, to pull the rug out from under this program which is conserving and preserving many other areas simply on a voluntary basis, I think is a wrong decision to make here tonight. I think that the parks and cultural sites are one of the things that our Nation is most proud about.

I would say that in the future, our Nation needs to lead on an international basis, and if we cannot do it on a voluntary basis, one wonders where we can do it. If there is something wrong with what is happening in the Everglades and that area is at risk or something in the Yellowstone, the fact of the matter is it is up to us to try to correct that. If other nations are calling our attention to it, as we do in their Nation when there are problems, I think it is entirely appropriate.

There is no effect on private lands that comes from the World Heritage Convention. It may come from the generic laws with regard to parks or public lands, but it does not flow from that. I think in that case we do it in a very democratic manner.

I urge Members to reject this bad amendment.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the comments from my friend from Minnesota and my other friend from California. I heard some sort of analogy that this designation equated with the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval.

Mr. Chairman, this is not simply some sort of travel guide, something to be desired, for what it does is establish a framework by which, in essence, another body, an international body, exerts control and influence on property decisions of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, the question is not about parks, for we all stand in favor of our National Parks and Heritage Sites that this Congress articulates, that this Congress commemorates, but there should be no misunderstanding that in some way, shape, or fashion we would cede any of that authority, which rests constitutionally, which rests traditionally with this body in this legislative branch, with the Congress of the United States.

To allow the opportunity, as my friend from Minnesota mentioned, economic development outside of Yellowstone National Park and reasonable proximity, to have these types of actions by an international body to, in essence, condemn economic activity, I believe is wrong. The Congress of the United States and landowners who are American citizens should make those decisions.

Accordingly, if you want to stand for sovereignty and the primacy of American law, so there is no misunderstanding, so there is no usurpation of that authority by any international body, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 273, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) will be postponed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE) assumed the chair.

report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 507) "An Act to provide for the conservation and development of water and related resources, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to construct various projects for improvements to rivers and harbors of the United States, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 2000

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Illinois: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following:

TITLE VIII—ADDITIONAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 801. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Department of Justice to provide a grant to any law enforcement agency except one identified in an annual summary of data on the use of excessive force published by the Attorney General pursuant to 210402(c) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 14142(c)).

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that we offer today, the Davis-Meek-Rush amendment, merely requires that the Attorney General put into practice what is already existing law. It does not impose any new requirements or change existing law.

The 1994 Crime Control Act requires the Attorney General to collect data from State and local law enforcement agencies relative to complaints regarding the use of excessive force. We find it necessary to introduce this amendment because efforts to get this data from the more than 17,000 law enforcement agencies, to date, by the Attorney General have been less than satisfactory.

It is my understanding that there have been efforts that could have made this information available, but, instead of requiring that it be provided, it has been asked for on a volunteer basis. We find that totally unacceptable. It does not provide the information that is needed. We want to make sure that local authorities are providing the information relative to the level of complaints about police brutality and misconduct.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does any Member seek time in opposition?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition and would reserve my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, and the reason is very simple. The only way we can begin to solve the police brutality problem is to hold municipalities accountable for wrongdoings. This amendment would allow the Department of Justice to limit the funding of police departments if they do not give vital statistics on police brutality to the Department of Justice.

Through the current law, the Attorney General collects data and provides a summary. If they have a problem retrieving data from a police department which is cited in the summary, funds should not go to that municipality or that police department.

□ 1830

As the cochairman of the Congressional Black Caucus on police brutality with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), we have heard hours of testimony on the need to hold law enforcement departments accountable for egregious acts against citizens.

In every city, Chicago, Washington, D.C., and New York, and we will be traveling to Los Angeles, it is the same complaint. If we do not have cooperation from our police departments, we should not give them funding. We need some legislation with teeth to enforce the fact that we will not be blind to police brutality and misconduct.

This amendment is a step in the right direction. We demand and must have integrity of our government and integrity of the police department so that the good police officers are not branded with the bad. By making sure that these municipalities report the figures so that we can truly solve the problem, this is the way that we can combat that and resolve our problems with respect to the police force.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH).

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. As a Member of this body, I have heard victim after victim, attorney after attorney, family after family, express to me the severity of the problem of police brutality and misconduct in our Nation's cities and our Nation's towns.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the